

United States Patent and Trademark Office

75

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/050,655		01/16/2002	Damian J. Gallina	01-496-A	7537
20306	7590	01/30/2004		EXAMINER	
		BOEHNEN HULB	WINSTON, RANDALL O		
SUITE 3200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO,	IL 6	0606	1654		
				DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. 1		Applie	cation No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			0,655	GALLINA, DAMIAN J.					
			iner	Art Unit					
		RAND	ALL WINSTON	1654					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address									
Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
· · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 November 2002</u> .								
<u> </u>									
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-8 and 11-24</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	Claim(s) <u>9 and 10</u> is/are rejected.								
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers									
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
4.0.	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120									
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. 									
Attachmen									
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape			(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)					
S. Patent and Tr	ademark Office	630 3							

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Applicants' election with traverse of Group V, of claims 9-10, in their response to the restriction requirement received on November 6, 2003 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that the applicant argues that Group I, III, V-VI and XII are classified in the same class, i.e., class 424. Further Groups I, III, V, and XII are classified in the same subclass, i.e., subclass 96.62. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that the search and examination of Groups I, III, V-VI, XII can be made without undue burden on the Examiner.

Applicants' argument is not found persuasive because, as the Examiner explained in the Restriction Requirement (10/03/2003), the claimed six methods are distinguishable from each other because the six unrelated methods' inventive groups are directed to different inventions which are not connected in design, operation, and/or effect. Moreover, the six compositions are unrelated because they contain different amounts to obtained their preamble objective. Therefore, examination of the suggested rejoined groups would impose undue burden on examiner because the compositions and/or methods are not disclosed as capable of use together because they have different modes of operation, they have different functions, and/or they have different effects. One would not have to practice the various methods and/or use the various compositions at the same time to practice just one method alone and/or one composition alone.

The restriction requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either an asserted utility or a well established utility that any composition can prevent a mammal from HIV infection.

Claims 9-10 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either an asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above that any composition can prevent a mammal from obtaining HIV, thus, one skilled in the art clearly would not reasonably believe the claimed invention would prevent a mammal from obtaining HIV infection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because one can not extrapolate the teaching of the specification to the claimed invention because there is no guidance on or exemplification of any correlation between the claimed invention's in vitro assay examples in the specification and the claimed in vivo prevention and/or treatment of HIV infection in a mammal. The in vitro experimental data presented is clearly not drawn to the in vivo prevention and/or treatment of a mammal with HIV. Fresheny (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New york, p4) teaches that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between in vitro cultured cells and their counterparts in vivo. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a three-dimensional geometry and their propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation in vivo. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant in vitro but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light. Thus, the specification and working examples provide insufficient guidance with regard to the issue of whether the claimed invention's in vitro assay stated in the specification would actually work in vivo of preventing and/or treating HIV infection in a mammal. For the above reason, since no evidence has been provided which would allow one of skill in the art to predict the efficacy of the claimed methods with a reasonable expectation of success, undue

Application/Control Number: 10/050,655

Art Unit: 1654

experimentation would be required to practice the claimed inventions with a reasonable expectation of success.

Furthermore, the factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (a) the breadth of the claims; (b) the nature of the invention; © the state of the prior art; (d) the level of one of ordinary skill; (e) the level of predictability in the art; (f) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (g) the existence of working examples; and (h) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Per reference to the Wands factors, due to the large quantity of experiment necessary to demonstrate the in *vivo* prevention and/or treatment of HIV infection in a mammal, the lack of /guidance presented in the specification of only providing *vitro* data on pages 6-19, the absence of working examples directed to the in *vivo* prevention and/or treatment of HIV infection in a mammal, the contradictory state of the prior art as disclosed by Fresheny (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New york, p4), undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RANDALL WINSTON whose telephone number is 571-272-0972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/050,655

Art Unit: 1654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 703-306-3220. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-3110.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

LEON B. LANKFORD, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER